

Draft 3/39/2012

Sr. Prudence Allen, RSM
Archbishop Charles J. Chaput, OFM cap. Chair of Philosophy
St. John Vianney Theological Seminary
Denver, Colorado

Ransoming Gender

When asked to identify our gender, most of us would answer by selecting one of the two words in the following pairs: male or female, masculine or feminine, man or woman. In Ancient Greece, the philosopher Aristotle stated that in the natural world living things often could not be generalized into absolute universals. He concluded with the principle that , “all science is of that which is always or for the most part.”¹ The philosophers task was to identify in different species of living things the most essential attributes or characteristics which were always or for the most part true in order to include them in the definition of the thing. In one example, Aristotle suggests that we could propose ‘the human being is a featherless bi-ped’ as a definition that separated human beings from other species of animals within the same genus. He concluded, however, that the attribute of rationality rather than the attribute of having (or not having) feathers was more proximate to the deep inner reality that distinguished human beings from other species of animals.

The attempt to identify essential characteristics which differentiate females from males within the species of human beings has a long and varied history in philosophy. Research in the history of the concept of woman in philosophy reveals three broad historical periods. *First*, from approximately 750 BC to around 1500 AD the defining characteristics of woman all referred to her sex as the female

biological starting point, and of man all referred to his sex as the male biological starting point.² The differentiating sexual characteristics included observable anatomy and evidence of differentiated reproductive systems. *Second*, from approximately 1500-1850 philosophers became aware of deeper anatomic sexual differences and added culturally engendered masculine and feminine characteristics to their identification of essential characteristics. In this second period definitions included observable sex differences as before, but added some culturally common masculine and/or feminine characteristics. This more complex approach to woman's and man's respective identities can be represented as moving from a one dimensional starting point and line (male—man and female—woman) to a two-dimensional triangular definitions of a woman's gender (including her sex) or a man's gender (including his sex).³

Third, from approximately 1850-present philosophers introduced various three-dimensional models depicting a man defining himself as a particular kind of man in relation to his male and culturally masculine characteristics and a woman defining herself as a particular kind of woman in relation to her female and culturally feminine characteristics. In a tetrahedron-type model a man incorporated culturally feminine characteristics and a woman incorporated culturally masculine characteristics (Carl Jung and Edith Stein). In a spiraling-cone model with female as its starting point, feminine was characterized as a woman's way of acting in the world, and with male as its starting point, masculine was characterized as a man's way of acting in the world (Karol Wojtyla/John Paul II).⁴

In the mid-twentieth century, a development through which a woman could define what kind of woman she wanted to be and a man what kind of man he wanted to be, when joined with technological advances in surgery began to open up a new situation. The boundaries of gender identity among a small percentage of human beings were pushed wide open through the rejection of the biological starting

point of those who were “always or for the most part” male or female. Soon justifications for ‘deconstructions of gender,’ occurred in concert with an historical development of various technologies. These usually were applied to situations of ambiguous sexual anatomy, genes, or hormones; fascination with hermaphrodites; preferences for various culturally engendered characteristics, attraction to an androgynous model of human being, radical feminism and rejection of males, masculinity or men; deconstruction of language and deconstruction of the concepts of the human being, man, and woman. Today we are facing a continued deconstruction of gender in which the ‘exception’ seeks to become the rule. In what follows, I hope to explain what happened and how the concept of gender and the word ‘gender’ should and can be ransomed.

The Ancient Origin of the Concept and Word ‘Gender’ (9th c. BC-350BC): Scripture and Philosophy

To begin, a distinction needs to be made between a concept and a word. Simply put, a concept is a structured thought about a class of things; and a word is a linguistic way to represent the concept. When was the concept of gender first articulated as a structured thought about a class of things? When was the word ‘gender’ first recorded in western history? The Hebrew Bible has the earliest written testimony to the *concept* of gender. Sometime between the 9th and 8th centuries BC the Hebrew word ‘ya la d’ was introduced to represent the thought ‘to generate.’ It was especially applied to a man ‘ish’ and a woman ‘ishah’ (from man ‘min ish’) as the two co-principles of the human species.⁵

The Scriptural root of the *word* gender, or ‘gen’, is also in Latin translations of the Hebrew Testament in different, but related ways. For example, in the first book of the Bible, *Genesis*, the root is

embedded in the word 'generationes' (the generations of heaven and earth Gen. 2:4); in 'primogenitis' (firstling or first born of cattle, Gen 4:4); in 'generationis ... Masculum et feminam creatit eos et benedixit illis... genuit Seth..., genuitque filios et filias.' (This is the book of the generations of Adam... Male and female he created them, and he blessed them...he became the father of Seth... and he had other sons and daughters. Gen.5: 1, 2, and 4).

The source of the English word "gender" is the Greek verb ginomai (givnomai) whose root is gen (gen). Ginomai has a wide range of meaning among which are "to come into existence", "to be born" and "to be produced". This is the verb that is principally used of God's acts of creation in Genesis 1 and from it is derived the noun "Genesis" (GevnesiV), which means "origin" or "descent". The Greek root appears in Latin also in words signifying giving birth and begetting, such as the verbs gigno and genero (cf. Gen. 6.9 et [Noe] genuit tres filios Sem Ham et Iafeth). It is also found in nouns such as genus and generatio (cf. Gen.6.9 hae generationes Noe. Noe vir iustus atque perfectus in generationibus suis). It is also found in the Latin adjective genitalis, as in Lucretius 4.1044 partes genitales ("the genital parts").

Notice that in Scripture the root 'gen' is embedded through connection with the history of families from generation to generation; the creation of male and female, man and woman, as masculine and feminine, and generating together from one generation to another. Their union in begetting provides the necessary foundation for history. The blessing by God of this relation as co-principals of generation, and his covenant with them for all future generations provides the origins of our understanding of the meaning of the root of gender or 'gen' as in generation of the human species.⁶

In the second book of the Bible, *Exodus* 13:13 we discover the root 'gen' in a word identifying the first born son in '*Omne autem primogenitum hominis de filiis tuis pretio redimes.*' The Hebrew text has "b'kor adam," which means the 'first born of man'. The Vulgate (Latin version) and Septuagint (Greek version) translates literally with "*primogenitum hominis*" first born man. So, here the gender of the one born is indicated by the compound term "man/human'. The final example, for the purpose of this introduction is found in *Leviticus* 19:19 in which the Latin phrase '*generis animalis*' indicates the verb 'to breed' or 'to gender.'⁷

From this brief introduction into the Scriptures, in theological anthropology the primary way the concept of gender is revealed in a variety of different contexts is through its root 'gen' and its association with the generation of children. Turning to 4th century BC philosophical anthropology in Ancient Greek Philosophy, we also find both the concept of gender as begetting and its association with the root of the word 'gen.' Aristotle's work in natural science, *The Generation of Animals*, written between the years 347 and 335 BC, offers clear evidence to support this claim. In the Loeb Greek-English edition of Aristotle's *Generation of Animals*, A. L. Peck, the translator makes the following observations in his introduction: "In the title of the treatise, $\gamma \acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ is commonly translated "generation," and this is a convenient rendering of it there; but we must not forget that $\gamma \acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ also refers to the whole process of an animal's development until it has reached its completion; that is to say, $\gamma \acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ includes the whole subject of reproduction and embryology."⁸

In the *Generation of Animals* Aristotle soon differentiates males from females in the same species of animals as follows: "By a 'male' animal we mean one which generates in another, by 'female' one which generates in itself."⁹ In his attempts to explain *how* the male and female generate, Aristotle

development until it has reached its completion; that is to say, $\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \sigma \iota \varsigma$ includes the whole subject of reproduction and embryology.”⁸

In the *Generation of Animals* Aristotle soon differentiates males from females in the same species of animals as follows: “By a ‘male’ animal we mean one which generates in another, by ‘female’ one which generates in itself.”⁹ In his attempts to explain how the male and female generate, Aristotle made the erroneous hypothesis that the males provided only the soul power and the females only the matter.¹⁰ Yet, in his basic distinction between male human beings as generating in another (outside the self in the female) and female human beings as generating in the self (through the help of the semen from the male), Aristotle correctly provided essential characteristics in defining males and females in the human species.

In a subsequent passage from the same text, Aristotle elaborates on these defining differences:

Now male and female differ in respect of their *logos*, in that the power or faculty possessed by the one differs from that possessed by the other; but they differ also to bodily sense, in respect of certain physical parts. They differ in their *logos*, because the male is that which has the power to generate in another (as was stated above), while the female is that which can generate in itself, i.e., it is that out of which the generated offspring, which is present in the generator, comes into being. Very well, then: they are distinguished in respect of their faculty, and this entails a certain function. Now for the exercise of every function instruments are needed, and the instruments for physical faculties are the parts of the body. Hence it is necessary that, for the purpose of copulation and procreation, certain parts should exist, parts that are different from each other, in respect of which the male will differ from the female... . Now in the female this special part is what is called the uterus, and in the male the regions about the testes and the penis...¹¹

Two important points need to be drawn from this elaboration. First, the distinction between males and females with respect to the faculty or power of generating outside of the self and as generating in the self lead to differences in bodily parts which can make these powers operate differently.

Second, while the parallel between the female uterus and male penis is identified, there is no parallel with the male testes identified. It will take almost two-thousand years for the discovery of the true function of the ovaries to occur. Indeed, female ovulation that will become a significant root of the feminine genius in the work of Karol Wojtyla. John Paul II.

In order not to get ahead of ourselves at this point, we can state that by the time of Aristotle the concept and root of the word 'gender' or gen has been well established both in Scripture and philosophy by 300 BC. We have also shown that in a simple way this root, 'gen' with its association with male-female differentiation within the human species is specifically joined to the generation of human beings by the union of males and females through their specific powers and bodily parts.

A secondary meaning of the word 'gender' in Ancient Greek philosophy is found in Aristotle's Rhetoric, written between 335-330 BC, after his *Generation of Animals*. Aristotle specifically applies the Greek word for 'gender' to the study of nouns, when he refers to the philosopher Protagoras (c. 485-415BC), who was the first to offer a science of language: "The fourth rule consists in keeping the genders distinct—masculine, feminine, and neuter, as laid down by Protagoras..."¹² The original Greek is relevant here, not only because of the use of the word for gender (γέννη), but also because the word for 'neuter' (ἄνευ) which means, according to a note of the translator John Henry Freese, "inanimate things," the classification probably being male, female, and inanimate, not the grammatical one of masculine, feminine, and neuter."¹³ Another sense of the inanimate word is a tool or non living thing of use.

As we bring this introductory section to a close let us ponder a reflection of Martin Heidegger when he thought about the roots of words in ancient Greek philosophy:

Herzog

Words are not terms, and thus are not like buckets and kegs from which we scoop a content that is there. Words are wellsprings that are found and dug up in the telling, wellsprings that must be found and dug up again and again, that easily cave in, but that at times also well up when least expected. If we do not go to the spring again and again, the buckets and kegs stay empty, or their content stays stale.¹⁴

Ransoming Gender will require us to return to the well-spring of the root 'gen' many times along the way. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology* includes the following rich language-family united through their route 'gen': gender, genealogy, generate, generous (nobly born), genesis, genetic, gene, genial (nuptial, productive, joyous), genital (external generative organs), genitive (grammatical possessor or source), genius (innate capacity, person possession prevalent disposition of spirit), genocide, gens, gentleman, gentlewoman, genuine, and -geny (mode of production).¹⁵

Three Characteristics of Gender Identity (300BC-1650 AD): Anatomy, Clothes, and Language

Science studies anatomy: Leaving aside the Hippocratic and Aristotelian false hypotheses about the elements wet and dry; hot and cold and speculations about their relation to the male's ability to provide soul power or form in generation and the female's lack thereof, we will focus instead on other engendered distinguishing characteristics. With the work of 4th century BC Aristotle, as mentioned above, significant differences between the two human sexes, female and male, were identified through empirical observations of anatomy, specifically **genitalia** or testicles and penis in males and the uterus and clitoris in females. Although Aristotle studied the eggs in other kinds of female animals, he did not think that female human beings provided any fertile seed in generation.

The Stoic Galen (131-201AD) perceived the effects in women of what we know today as ovulation, but he concluded that they were only 'infertile secretions' and not seed.¹⁶ The Neoplatonic philosopher Porphyry (233-305) argued for a minor formative role of human females in his study of embryology, *Pros Gauron*. He stated that, "When, leaving the father, the sperm has been injected into the mother, the creative natural principle associates itself with the vegetative power of the mother and her soul."¹⁷ The Islamic physician and philosopher Avicenna (980-1037), in *The Canon of Medicine*, introduced a distinction between primary and secondary sexual characteristics of women and of men. In his work we begin to see a distinguishing of essential from non-essential characteristics: "...[T]he generative organs some of which are essential and others auxiliary. The essential function is that of forming generative elements; the auxiliary functions are those of giving the masculine and feminine form and temperament. These functions are inseparable from the race, and yet play no part in the essence of life."¹⁸

With the beginning of the scientific study of anatomy, Mondino da Luzzi (1276-1328) began to dissect the human body and he published *Anathomia*, which became the primary source for all medical schools that taught surgery. Although he discovered the ovaries, Mondino concluded that women provided no seed. Instead: "...[T]he cavities of the testicles in women... are not as the testicles of men, but rather...generate a saliva-like moisture which causes the libido."¹⁹ The study of anatomy of the male and the female bodies continued with Leonardo da Vinci, (15th-16th century) who suggested, but did not prove, that women also had seed, Vesalius (16th century), Fabricus (16th-17th century), and his student William Harvey (1578-1657), who became physician to King James in England. Harvey discovered valves in the arteries and veins and concluded that the blood circulated in the human body, rather than heated up and was expelled, as

Aristotle had argued. Harvey's discovery led to the complete rejection of the Aristotelian theory of generation as it was based on his faulty understanding of blood, semen in men, and milk in women. In his publication of *De generatione animalium*, William Harvey's meticulous observation of numerous dissections of animals (especially of doe and hind), supplied by the avid hunting of King James, led him further to unequivocally defend the existence of female seed. In his words: "all creative force or vital power is not derived exclusively from the male."²⁰ Consequently, from the 4th century BC to the 17th century AC philosophers were just beginning to understand more correctly how male and female genitalia functioned in generation.

Next, moving more to the surface of a woman's or man's identity, clothes were also offered as defining essential characteristics. Three selected examples: from Juvenal's sixth satire, the trial of Joan of Arc, and some 17th century satires *Hic Mulier* and *Haec Vir* will provide the basis for this approach.

The Latin author Juvenal's (c. 60-140), Satire VI "Against Women" popular during his second century lifetime continued its popularity in manuscript form for over a thousand years. Then it was printed, more than any other satire, over one hundred and fifty-nine times, between 1470 and 1739. It was also translated from Latin into various vernacular languages, spreading throughout European Italy, Germany, France, Holland, Portugal, and England.²¹ In one part of the satire we discover Juvenal mocking women who take on men's clothing for purposes of fighting in a gladiatorial contest public arena.

What modesty can you expect in a woman who wears a helmet, abjures her own sex (*fugit a sexu*), and delights in feats of strength? Yet she would not choose to be a man, knowing the superior joys of woman hood.... See how she pants as she goes through her prescribed exercises; how she bends under the weight of her helmet; how big and coarse are the

bandages which enclose her haunches; and then laugh when she lays down her arms and shows herself to be a woman.²²

Clearly, the protective pieces of clothing of a gladiator were identifying characteristics of male human beings. Thus, the initial humor of the satire flowed from the discrepancy found when a woman chose to wear them and to engage in activities associated with them. Another discrepancy also flowed from the double claim that the woman abjures her own sex initially by wearing these clothes, but then reclaims her female sex by revealing her female body before the audience.

Law appeals to clothes: When we turn to the trial of Joan of Arc (1412-1431), which occurred in the final year of her life all humor disappears; and we see a young woman fighting for her life. The fact that she wore men's clothing, and 'relapsed' into wearing it again, was used to condemn her to death. Testimony from the trial itself will be introduced briefly here. Article V of the twelve articles which formed the basis for her condemnation included: "...she must be suspected of idolatry in the execration of her self and her clothing..."²³ After her first interrogation in February 1431 by 63 male assessors and 2 judges, the charges were summarized. The number III included: "that this woman is an apostate, as she has had the hair which God gave her as a veil cut, in an inappropriate fashion, and also, in the same manner, has abandoned the clothing of women and has dressed herself as men do."²⁴ Joan answered in an interrogation on February 27th that her decision to put on men's clothes was done by God's commandment. She added in another interrogation of March 17 that "These clothes do not burden my soul and to wear them is not against the Church."²⁵ It is clear that Joan realized that her clothing was accidental and not essential to her identity as a woman. However, the repeated charge of her "monstrous audacity" in

wearing clothes “accorded to the masculine sex” was brought up in her trial March 12, 17, 25, 28, 31, April 18, and May 23.

On May 24, after being denied an appeal to Rome and threatened with death by fire, Joan signed an abjuration which involved an acceptance that it was wrong of her to wear “...dissolute, deformed, and dishonest clothes, contrary to the decency of nature, and hair cut round in the style of men, contrary to all manners of the female sex. ...”²⁶ She was instead given a sentence of perpetual imprisonment and brought women’s clothes to wear. What happened next appears to be that Joan, now wearing women’s clothes, was sexually harassed in her jail cell both by visitors and by guards. In any event, she changed back into her military apparel, or men’s clothes and was subsequently classified as a “relapse” or “backslider” and put to death by fire. At her trial of rehabilitation, in 1450, twenty years after her death, the fraudulence of the original charges included: “X. That after being ordered to resume and wear female clothing, she was compelled to put on male clothing; which was the reason why the self-styled judges pronounced her relapsed, they seeking not her repentance but her death.”²⁷

The Turn to Language: When the Philological Society collected materials on the history of the use of the word ‘gender’ in the English Language, some very interesting things about the concept of gender in the 14th -17th centuries can be seen. When ‘gender’ is listed as a ‘subject’, it’s root is listed as the greek γένν- to produce; and in its grammatical meaning, “In the Indo-European lang[ua]ge[s] there were originally three genders, the masculine and feminine, to which respectively belonged the great majority of nouns denoting male and female persons or animals; and the neuter, including chiefly nouns denoting things without sex.”²⁸ When ‘gender’ is listed as a ‘verb’, it includes the following meanings: to beget, engender, produce (offspring); to copulate;

to produce by natural process, generate. Then the word 'gendering' similarly involves the concepts of begetting or breeding, and leads to geneologies, geneological, genealogist, genealogize, and so on. The Dictionary includes many examples from literature written from 1375-1850 in which the word 'gender' or 'gendering' directly imparts these meanings.

A collection of three satires written around in the beginning of the 17th century turns around the intermixing of the respective identities of the 'genders' woman and man and of language gender, as expressed in familiar Latin. The historical context is identities of women and men after the Reform of Henry VIII in England, and the subsequent rule of Queen Victoria (considered by many to be a 'masculine woman' and later King James (considered by many to be a 'feminine man.').

The first satirical pamphlets published in England *Hic Mulier*, inverted Latin grammar relating to a woman's identity.²⁹ Published in 1620, the anonymous author of this pamphlet introduces the English words *genders* in relation to women and men and connects them as well to *generations*:

For since the days of Adam women were never so masculine; masculine in their *genders* and whole *generations*, from the Mother, to the youngest daughter; masculine in number, from one to multitudes; masculine in case, even from the head to the foot; masculine in mood, from both speech, to impudent action; and masculine in tense: for (without redress) they were, are, and will be still most masculine, most mankind, and most monstrous.³⁰

The author not only joins the linguistic categories of masculine and feminine endings directly to men's and women's identities, but also the linguistic categories of number, case, mood, and tense to various aspects of a woman's identity. The inversion of the masculine word *Hic* or 'this' and its connection to the feminine word *mulier*, or woman is humorous because it reveals the underlying relationship between gender, generation, and women and man's identities. Right in the

introduction to this text, the author indicates that he is not attempting to break grammatical rules of Latin by placing a masculine adjective in from of a feminine noun: "*Hic mulier*; ... How now? ... Pardon me... I will maintain, if it be not the truest Latin in our Kingdom, it is the commonest."³¹

The author divides women into two groups, on the one hand, those who are culturally consistent women in their dress, behavior, and mannerisms, and on the other hand, those who are like men in their dress, behavior, and mannerisms. This second group are generalized to all other aspects of a man's behavior, until their identity is completely confused or erased: "They will be man-like not only from the head to the waist, but to the very foot, and in every condition: man in body by attire, man in behavior by rude complement, man in nature by aptness to anger, man in action by pursuing revenge, man in wearing weapons, man in using weapons: And in brief, so much man in all things, that they are neither men, nor women, but just good for nothing."³² Later on he calls them 'the new hermaphrodites.'³³

Haec Vir is the second of the three satirical pamphlets focusing on man-woman identities. The dialogue begins with the two interlocutors unable to recognize one another's gender because their clothes are of the opposite one.

<i>Haec-Vir:</i>	Are you a woman?
<i>Hic-Mul:</i>	Are you a man?...
<i>Haec Vir:</i>	Yes I am.
<i>Hic-Mul:</i>	Your name; most tender piece of masculine.
<i>Haec-Vir:</i>	<i>Haec-Vir</i> ...But what is yours...?
<i>Haec-Mul:</i>	Near a kin to your goodness; and compounded of fully as false Latin. The world calls me, <i>Hic-Mulier</i> .
<i>Haec-Vir:</i>	What, <i>Hic-Mulier</i> , the Man-Woman. ³⁴

After a series of satirical arguments drawing upon distinctions of nature and culture, and comparing superficial aspects of clothing and body, with deeper characteristics of human identity

including reason, the masculine woman convinces the feminine man to become a masculine man and agrees to return to her original identity as a feminine woman. He concludes: "... we will here change our attires, as we have chang'd our minds, and with our attires, our names. I will no more be Haec-Vir, but *Hic Vir*, nor you *Hic Mulier*, but *Haec Mulier*."³⁵

From just these two short satires, we can see that the concept of 'gender' and the word 'gender' were part of the culture of the English language in such a way that the respective identities of a man and of a woman were still being associated with characteristics including clothes and mannerisms. Yet, the deeper root always included genitalia and engendering through the union of male and female in successive generations or genealogies.

The Cartesian Reform, Margaret Mead, Anthropology, and Sex Roles

René Descartes's (1592-1650) place in the history of the concept of woman is very significant because of his rejection of the Aristotelian-Thomistic view of the human person as a soul/body composite. Descartes's radical separation of mind and body into two independent substances, his identification of the human being with the mind in its activity of reasoning, and his description of the mind as a unisex entity together brought about a revolution in the history of the concept of the human being. Descartes' philosophical texts *Discourse on Method* (1637), *Meditations on First Philosophy* (1641), *Principles of Philosophy* (1644), and *Treatise on the Passions* (1649), were essentially neutral towards questions of gender identity. Descartes claimed in *Meditations* 6 that "simply by knowing I exist and seeing at the same time that absolutely nothing else belongs to my nature or essence except that I am a thinking thing, I can infer correctly that my essence consists solely in the fact that I am a thinking thing."³⁶ With the

"Cartesian turn to the subject," the human being is characterized as a "thinking thing" with no reference to gender differentiation.

A disciple of Descartes, the British physician and philosopher John Locke (1632-1704) is credited with providing the foundation for the scientific field of psychology. Consider what Locke wrote about the distinction between the identity of the human being and the identity of the person: "The identity of the same man consists; viz, in nothing but a participation of the same continued life, by constantly fleeting particles of matter, in succession vitally united to the same organized body."³⁷ He separated the person, as an inner reality from the man, a bodily reality: "...In this alone consists personal identity, i.e., the sameness of a rational being: and as far as this consciousness can be extended backwards to any past action or thought, so far reaches the identity of that person."³⁸

Charles Taylor (1931-) identified a significant philosophical error in Locke's approach to the human person in *Sources of the Self* which we will discover coming to the fore in the subsequent medical definition of 'gender': "It is assumed that something we call consciousness or self-consciousness could be clearly distinguished from its embodiment, and the two allowed to separate and recombine in various thought experiments, that our self-awareness is somehow detachable from its embodiment. ... This perfectly detachable consciousness is an illusion, I would claim..."³⁹ Taylor elaborates further on Locke's strange understanding of the human self in: Locke's adoption of Descartes' disengaged ego, as "the growing ideal of a human agent who is able to remake himself by methodical and disciplined action."⁴⁰

Having indicated that the modern social science of psychology was embedded in a Cartesian and Lockean view of the person as a radical dualism between consciousness of personal

identity and material bodily identity, let us turn now to Margaret Mead (1901-1978)'s anthropological study of male and female sex roles in primitive societies. Mead always used the word 'sex' in writing about sex roles, sex styles, sex behavior. She introduced the word 'gender' once in a discussion about the difficulty a person has to imagine contrasts without other societies (i.e., polygamous). In her words: "We know by sad experience how difficult it is for those who have been reared in within one civilization ever to get outside its categories, to imagine, for instance, what a language could be like that had thirteen genders. Oh, yes, one says masculine, feminine, and neuter—and what in the world are the other ten?"⁴¹

In her autobiography *Blackberry Winter: My Earlier Years* Mead tells us that "the problem [of sex differences] which I had taken to the field [in 1931], the question of how culturally attributed contrasts in masculine and feminine behavior differentiated the character structure of men and women, seemed to have yielded very little."⁴² After discovering that she and her husband Reo (from New Zealand) shared different temperaments, yet she and another man Gregory (who became her next husband) shared the same temperament, that it would be "nonsensical" to define one as feminine and the other as masculine.⁴³ (BW 216-219).

Slowly but surely, Margaret Mead became convinced that nearly all sex roles were detached from a deeper identity as a woman or a man. By 1949, in *Male and Female*, Mead considered the variety of sex-roles or sex-styles to be culturally learned. She held some fundamental assumptions about the fragility of paternity for men, and "the essentials in maleness and femaleness with which every society must reckon, and regularities as well as differences."⁴⁴

At the same time, however, Margaret Mead posed fundamental questions that opened the door wide for the manipulation of a woman or man's respective identities. One example: "Has

every individual a bisexual potential that may be physiologically evoked by hormone deficit or surplus, which may be psychologically evoked by abnormalities in the process of individual maturation, which may be sociologically invoked by rearing boys with women only, or segregating boys away from women entirely, or by prescribing and encouraging various forms of social inversion?"⁴⁵ And another example: "Characteristic after characteristic in which the differences within a sex are so great that there is enormous overlapping are artificially assigned as masculine or feminine."⁴⁶ (MF 373). By the end of Margaret Mead's life, the field of anthropology had been revolutionized by her methodologies and conclusions about the fragile link between sex and gender identity.

Redefining Gender: Dr. John Money and Medical Psychology

In what could be at first called 'The New Zealand Connection' John Money was born in Morrinsville, New Zealand, and graduated in 1944 with a double Masters degree in Psychology and Education from Victoria University in Wellington. Margaret Mead's first book *Coming of Age in Samoa* (1928), was widely distributed in New Zealand, which governed Western Samoa, and in the United States Navy, which governed Eastern Samoa according to a Mandate of the League of Nations.⁴⁷ It is reasonable to surmise that during his studies he would have learned about Margaret Mead's revolutionary approach to anthropology.

In a conference Money organized in 1970-1971, Dr. Saul Rosenzweig linked Margaret Mead and John Money: "Mead...stressed the cultural modeling of the sex roles.... From clinical research it was concluded that the ultimate sex role of the patient depended mainly not on the biological criteria, but on the two last social and psychological factors which, incidentally,

appeared to be almost irreversibly fixed by age two (Money, 1968, 1969, 1971)".⁴⁸ Evidence that Dr. John Money considered himself to be developing a line of thought that began with Margaret Mead is provided by his later publications: "There is in my memory a clear image, dated 1972, of waiting for an elevator in Stockholm, talking, and having quite unexpectedly in my mind the idea that the final outcome of the discussion Margaret Mead and I were then concluding would have to be a book, I would have to write it, and its title would have to be *Love and Lovesickness*."⁴⁹

Backing up a little, in 1947 John Money came to the United States for studies first in Psychiatry at the University of Pittsburgh and then to complete his PhD in Psychology at Harvard in 1952, writing his Doctoral Dissertation on *Hermaphroditism: An Inquiry into the Nature of a Human Paradox*. Dr. Money was then hired right out of graduate school as a professor of pediatrics and medical psychology at Johns Hopkins University Medical School in Baltimore.

With two other psychiatrists Dr. Money headed up a new Psycho-hormonal Research Unit, studying 131 intersex individuals (persons born with ambiguous biological anatomical sexual characteristics) over a period of six years. In 1955, in the first published paper from Johns Hopkins on this research project, Money stated: "the conclusion that emerges is that sexual behavior and orientation as male or female does not have an innate, instinctive basis. In place of a theory of instinctive masculinity or femininity which is innate, the evidence of hermaphroditism lends support to a conception that, psychologically, sexuality is undifferentiated at birth and that it becomes differentiated as masculine or feminine in the course of the various experiences of growing up."⁵⁰ Money later called this time frame from birth to the settling of one's sexual identity as the 'gender gate' or 'gender window.'

In 1972 John Money co-authored with Anke A. Ehrhardt *Man and Woman Boy and Girl: The Differentiation and Dimorphism of Gender Identity from Conception to Maturity*. In this book gender identity was defined as: ... "the sameness, unity, and persistence of one's individuality as male or female (or ambivalent), in greater or lesser degree, *especially as it is experienced in self-awareness and behavior*. Gender identity is the private experience of gender role, and gender role is the public expression of gender identity."⁵¹ Next, gender role is circularly defined as: "...everything that a person says and does, to indicate to others or to the self the degree in which one is male or female or ambivalent. It includes but is not restricted to sexual arousal and response. Gender role is the public expression of gender identity, and gender identity is the private experience of gender role."⁵² These definitions established the subsequent framework of an artificially constructed new meaning for both the concept and the word 'gender' as primarily a socially constructed reality.

This redefinition of the word 'gender' within fifteen years became commonly used in scholarly contexts by medical doctors, psychologists, psychiatrists, sociologists, political scientists and into the broader public by journalists and other media personalities. To give just one example, in 1973 Saul Rosenzweig, PhD from the Departments of Psychology and Psychiatry, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri, in cites Money's theory several times to affirm what he calls the 'plasticity' of gender identity. Rosenzweig concludes: "Gender differences are, however, no longer conceived to be absolutes since they are molded by environmental interaction... More obvious even than genetic diversity is the uniqueness of each individuals response to his particular environment."⁵³ The ancient association of gender with the root 'gen' and male-female human

generation was separated by Dr. Money just as the Cartesian mind and body were separated and the Lockean consciousness of person and bodily continuity were separated.

John Money's professional papers on intersex studies won the Hofheimer Prize from the American Psychiatric Association, and John Money was soon able to convince Johns Hopkins to begin to offer adult transsexual surgeries, at a newly named Gender Identity Clinic. In the meantime, two research teams questioned Money's methods and conclusions in the intersex experiments. Milton Diamond, a graduate student studying the role of hormones in human behavior began his doctoral work at the University of Kansas in 1958, and published a paper in 1959 stating that Money's research samples were faulty because they all came from intersex individuals, not normal males or females; and he concluded that pre-birth factors lead to "gender identity being hardwired into the brain virtually from conception."⁵⁴ Also three psychiatrists from Toronto published in The Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal (1959) a serious critique of the statistical and research methods and surgical practices of Money's team.⁵⁵ Medical science, which is by nature self-correcting already began to bring critical evaluation to bear on Dr. John Money's research on individuals born with ambiguous sexual characteristics and his conclusions that extended to normal males and females born with unambiguous sexual characteristics.

Then in 1965 two identical twin boys were born to a young couple in Winnipeg, Canada. At the circumcision of the oldest twin, at 7 months, the physician misjudged the force of the electrical current, and his penis was destroyed. In February 1966 the parents watched a CBC program on which Dr. John Money which described "the wonders of gender transformation taking place at Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore."⁵⁶ They decided go to Dr. Money's clinic for help; and Dr. Money saw the opportunity for a controlled experiment on two identical twins, born

normally male, one of which could be surgically made female. He encouraged the parents with a Menonite background, and only highschool education to make a quick decision while the “gender identity gate” was still open. On July 3, 1967 their 22 month old son “underwent surgical castration”, or removal of the testes, at Money’s gender identity clinic.

Next, Dr. Money asked the parents to do everything they could to bring their son up as a girl. His orders paralleled the external characteristics of language, clothing, and sex roles. They changed his name from Bruce to Brenda and insisted that Brenda always be dressed in stereotyped girl’s clothes and be constantly reminded, again using stereotypes, that ‘girls do one thing and boys do another. The twin brother Brian remained the boy in the family. Neither child was told the truth about the original identity of Bruce until 1980, when they were forced to by the failure of Bruce to adapt to being Brenda by age of fifteen. As we will see this ‘forced experiment’ of Dr. John Money turned out to be an abysmal failure and as soon as the truth was told about what happened Brenda wanted to be the boy she always was.

Even more disturbing was the fact that Dr. Money had a fascination with pornography and with trying to forcing young children into early sexual experience. The twins, during a later interview by John Coloptino said that Dr. Money “would show us pictures of kinds—boys and girls— with no clothes on....; and also showed them pictures of adults engaged in sexual intercourse. ‘He’d say to us, I want to show you pictures of things that moms and dads do⁵⁷.’” Money thought that pornography, i.e., “explicit sexual pictures can and should be used as part of a child’s sex education.”⁵⁸ During annual visits when Janet and Ron brought their twins from Winnipeg to Money’s clinic in Baltimore, he encouraged sexual play among the two children and even suggested that the mother walk around nude at home and they parents allow

their children to observe them having sexual intercourse. To this last suggestion, fortunately, the parents refused to comply.

Upon discovering most of Dr. John Money's books in our seminary library (purchased by the older St. Thomas Seminary in the very years they were published), I began to wonder whether Dr. Money's mixture of pornography and medical clinic experiments led to a broader confusion about both a man's and woman's respective identities and about the proper place for sexual experience and even whether they contributed not only to the distortion of the meaning of 'gender' identity for most women and men, but also to the terrible wound of pedophilia.

One of the books from our seminary library which Dr. Money had co-edited on behalf of the American Psychopathological Association, Contemporary Sexual Behavior: critical issues in the 1970's, includes his presentation to the 1970-1971 annual conference, entitled "Pornography in the Home: A Topic in Medical Education." Dr. Money showed explicitly pornographic images to the audience and argued forcefully for the so-called value of sharing of this kind of imagery in schools and homes "into the total context of sex education."⁵⁹ I came to understand just as Dr. Money's use of pornography in method to introduce of a new meaning for the word 'gender' had the sordid past of seeking to corrupt the innocent so also his publications contributed to a distorted future, corrupting the innocent by fostering a false 'gender ideology'.

The Intentional Falsification of Gender Identity in a Gender Ideology

Dr. John Money made the fallacious argument about gender identity being primarily socially constructed as a generalized move from the very small percentage of children born with ambiguous sex identity to all children born unambiguously as male or female. He was determined

to provide empirical evidence for this argument by his identical twins, both born unambiguously male, and one now surgically changed externally into a female. Therefore, he ignored the warnings that contradicted his hypothesis each year when Brenda and Brian came for their annual visits to Johns Hopkins each year. In 1972, when the Reimer twins were six years old and Brenda already showing signs of acting more like a boy than a girl in school, at home, and during the annual check ups, Dr. Money went public about the experiment (while hiding the true identity of the family) in his book *Man and Woman Boy and Girl*. Money proclaimed the 'great success of his twins experiment'. Sprinkled through the book he observes, after describing his successes in gender identity-differentiation among human hermaphrodites, "A similar extraordinary contrast has been observed even which a child born as a normal male was surgically reassigned as a female...[I]n gender behavior, she is quite gender-different from her identical twin brother (see further details in Chapter 7)."⁶⁰

This new book of Money's was praised on its cover by *The New York Times* "The Brilliant New Landmark study of human sexuality...The most important work since the Kinsey Reports!"; *Time Magazine* soon followed, along with standard text books in medicine, sociology, women's studies, and feminist studies. The conclusion most often repeated was that sex and gender identity was more due to environmental factors than to genes, anatomy, hormones and other natural factors from conception, birth, and puberty. Money himself "made the case the centerpiece of his public addresses, rarely giving a speech in which he did not mention it."⁶¹ It is at this point that the beginnings of his gender ideology are clearly seen; he prefers to neglect the truth and to cling to an idealized version of his theory.

In *On Sexual Signatures: On Being a Man or a Woman*, published three years later in 1975, Money uses the word 'gender' in yet another phrase: "Your gender schemas are the framework of your *gender/identity role*."⁶² Yet he was still ignoring the contrary evidence that Brenda, now nine years old was continuing to demonstrate to all in school, home, and at the Hopkins gender clinic that she fought like a normal boy, hitting and attacking others, defending her brother Brian when he was picked on. Instead, in this book, Dr. Money again returns to his "identical twin boys" case which he identifies as "dramatic proof that the gender identity option is open at birth for normal infants and that social forces can intervene decisively..." And after the decision of the parents to bring up their son as a daughter, Money states: "The girl's subsequent history proves how well all three of them succeeded in adjusting to that decision."⁶³ However, in 1975 in a New York Times Book Review of *Sexual Signatures*, the reviewer following Money's own statements concluded that he "has been sailing contentedly through childhood as a genuine girl."⁶⁴ Money's personal gender ideology has now become a **cultural gender ideology**.

Brenda also absolutely refused to agree to Dr. Money's plan to consider another surgery to create a vaginal canal. With increasing difficulties in school and the intervention of a school psychologist, Dr. Money was able to convince Brenda to begin taking estrogen hormones, while still refusing any surgery. The parents were also encouraged to tell Brenda that she had had an accident as a child that needed to be repaired, but not to say anything about her being born as a boy. The conspiracy to hide the truth from both Brenda and Brian continues to feed the gender ideology of Dr. Money and to harm the innocent lives of the Reimer family.

At what would be the final visit in 1978 at Johns Hopkins University Gender Clinic, Dr. Money introduced 13 year old Brenda to an adult transsexual, and Brenda fled his office, never to

return again. In 1979 another psychiatrist Dr. Mary McKenty began to meet with Brenda for recurring difficulties at school and home. During the same time, Dr. Money came to Winnipeg to give two lectures at the university, and he contrived to stay overnight at the home of Brenda's family. They only learned later that the lectures were on pornography with his usual slides and videos even encouraging incest and group sex. At the same time, the BBC had discovered where Brenda lived and went to school and were secretly filming for a program called "Open Secret" on medical scandals. Dr. Diamond had published in two journals serious doubts about 'the twin' case even though Dr. Money and the general public continued to herald it.

A further criticism of Dr. John Money's research and practice came from within Johns Hopkins Medical School itself. In 1975, Dr. Paul McHugh, was appointed psychiatrist-in-chief at Johns Hopkins Hospital. He was not convinced about the value of sexual surgery and decided to request further verification that it was helping the patients. After receiving and reviewing the data as well as meeting with several of the patients himself Dr. McHugh concluded in the case of adults that "Hopkins was fundamentally cooperating with a mental illness" and that "to provide surgical alteration to the body of these unfortunate people was to collaborate with a mental disorder rather than to treat it."⁶⁵ He found that most of the female characteristics adopted by the surgically changed males were primarily stereotypes of external behavior and roles. This realization fits in with the historical development of so-called engendered characteristics considered such as language, clothing, and external roles. It was being introduced to an adult transexual who embodied this stereotypical behavior of a male turned into a female that had so instinctively shocked Brenda that she fled the Johns Hopkins clinic never to return.

Dr. Paul McHugh, after being named psychiatrist in chief, also requested a systematic follow up of children, especially the males who had been transformed into females. Two of these studies of led him to conclude that "re-engineered males were almost never comfortable as females once they became aware of themselves and the world. From the start of their active play life, they behaved spontaneously like boys... and most of those individuals who learned that they were actually genetic males wished to reconstitute their lives as males... and all this despite the earnest efforts by their parents to treat them as girls."⁶⁶ He stated that "we in the Johns Hopkins Psychiatry Department eventually concluded that human sexual identity is mostly built into our constitution by the genes we inherit and the embryogenesis we undergo."⁶⁷ Dr. McHugh closed down the gender identity clinic at Johns Hopkins Hospital in 1979.

Dr. Paul McHugh stated unequivocally in his critique of Dr. Money's approach: "I have witnessed a great deal of damage from sex-reassignment. The children transformed from their male constitution into female roles suffered prolonged distress and misery as they sensed their natural attitudes. Their parents usually lived with guilt over their decisions—second guessing themselves and somewhat ashamed of the fabrication, both surgical and social, they had imposed on their sons."⁶⁸ There is no doubt that both of the Reimer twins and their parents suffered a great deal of damage from the attempt to change their son Bruce's gender identity from its natural male into a surgically constructed and culturally stereotyped female.

In March 1980 Through the encouragement of a Scottish born psychiatrist in Winnepeg, Dr. Mary McKenty Brenda's father was told that it was time to tell exactly the truth about what happened to the 15 year old twins when they were young. As soon as Brenda learned the truth, she *immediately made the decision to revert to the biological male sex of her birth*, and to take the

name of David. He felt relief because that truth explained why he had always felt an interior conflict about his identity. His twin brother Brian also learned the truth on the same day. He responded by violently hitting a wall and proclaiming: "...[T]he first fourteen years of my life was a lie."⁶⁹

David went willingly through reconstructive surgery in 1981 in Winnipeg for his male identity to be repaired. On the same day his brother Brian attempted suicide. In an extensive interview David gave with John Colapinto several years later he shared a the content of a prayer that had poured out of his heart in those earlier years after he discovered his true gender as a man:

I did something I'd never done before. I wound up praying to God. I said, 'You know, I've had such a terrible life. I'm not going to complain to You, because You must have some idea of why You're putting me through this. But I could be a good husband if I was given the chance; I think I could be a good father, if I was given a chance.'⁷⁰

This prayer reveals something of great depth in his gender identity rising up out of his suffering, namely that he as a man is drawn essentially towards becoming a husband and a father. This fact accords with a conclusion of careful longitudinal scientific studies by Dr. Paul McHugh, who recommended that children with ambivalent genital identity should be raised 'according to its genetic sex' and wait for the child to mature and grow to recognize how his or her sexual identity emerges from within. David Reimer, clearly discovered from within who he was and who he wanted to be.

In 1983 Dr. John Money's course in human sexology was dropped by Johns Hopkins University. In 1986 he was forced to retire and move his office off campus.⁷¹ None-the-less, Dr Money continued to publish his articles and books internationally; he never corrected his earlier claims that gender is totally socially conditioned. Meanwhile, Dr. Money went completely silent

on his famous twin case, and also never publically refuted the impression that it had been a great success. He even made comments to suggest that he was just protecting the privacy of the family and twins by not speaking any more about the case.

To conclude this section on Dr. Money and the early roots of his gender ideology, I will briefly list the ultimate consequences for the family of identical twins which he had selected for his experiments. Brian Reimer developed Schizophrenia and committed suicide after two failed marriages around the age of 34. In 1990, David Reimer married a woman with 3 children and for several years his prayers were answered as he was both a husband and father. Then in 2004, two years after his brother Brian had committed suicide, David Reimer lost his job, lost his financial investments, and became separated from his wife; he then committed suicide at the age of 38. Both of their parents also had serious difficulties in life; their father sank into alcoholism and their mother into serious depression. In an appendix to his book *As Nature Made Him*, titled "David Reimer: A Tragic Update", John Colapinto wrote: "I shared his [David's] outrage over the fact that Dr. John Money's misreporting of his case had resulted in similar infant sex reassignments in thousands of other children...."⁷² They both decided to work together on the hard emotional work of documenting the historical details of his life "in order to alert the medical and scientific worlds to the actual outcome of this seminal case."⁷³

Gender Ideology 'Goes Viral'

Dr. John Money provided the 'host cell' for the redefinition of gender as the socially constructed identity of a human being as male, or female, or other, an identity that was plastic from birth and fixed after the age of two. Analogous to a virus, this understanding of gender as socially

constructed left his host cell and soon traveled to other susceptible living cells. An obvious question is: Why did not the fact Johns Hopkins University rejected this claim and shut down the gender identity clinic in 1979 lead to the death or at least isolation of this concept of gender identity? The answer is that for many years the scholarly world and wider public never knew that there was clear scientific evidence against this theory about gender identity. Dr. Money himself never publicly revised his position. Furthermore, he kept insisting that it was true despite all the contrary evidence that had been documented at Johns Hopkins University itself.

The full truth about the compromised support for Money's claims only became widely known by the public several years later when John Colapinto explored various aspects of the medical scandal in "The True Story of John/Joan" in *Rolling Stone* (December 11, 1997).⁷⁴ Then, in 2000, John Colapinto published his far-reaching historical record in *As Nature Made Him: The Boy Who Was Raised As A Girl*, which the New York Times heralded as "brilliantly researched" but did not suggest changing the meaning of gender identity as a result. One astute commentator writes inside the cover: "An object lesson in medical hubris and close-the-ranks collusion, and in the tragic results when *ideology* trumps common sense in thinking about sex and gender."⁷⁵

Step One: Alice Rossi (1922-2009) and Moderate Feminism:

A step in the rapid spread of gender ideology is found in the collaborative work of Dr. Money with beginning *feminist theory*; with the previously well-established field of sexology as represented by the Kinsey reports (*Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948) and *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (1953) and subsequent reports of Masters and Johnson (*Human Sexual Response* (1966) and *Human Sexual Inadequacy* (1970)).

The feminist connection occurred through Alice Rossi, who in 1959 was hired to teach full time in Sociology at the University of Chicago. In 1967 she taught at Johns Hopkins University and in 1969-1974 at Goucher College, both located in Baltimore. It was during this seminal time that in 1970-71 Dr. John Money was "largely responsible for ...a symposium," of the American Psychopathological Association, which brought together scholars from the interdisciplinary fields of medicine, psychology, and sociology.⁷⁶ This conference included in addition to the feminist sociologist Alice Rossi, the gynecologist William H. Masters, and the psychologists Virginia E. Johnson, John Money and Saul Rosenzweig. The proceedings of this conference, *Contemporary Sexual Behavior: Critical Issues in the 1970's* were published in Baltimore and London in 1973 by Johns Hopkins University Press, lending credibility to the conference and its authors work. John Money was one of the two editors of the book. The theme of pornography was also front and center in the proceedings at the same time as Money's gender theory gained prominence.⁷⁷ This conference provided a public space for the cross-fertilization of discussions about gender identity, various forms of sex activity, and sex roles. In sort, it provided a complex set of new willing hosts for the intellectual virus 'gender ideology.'

Dr. Alice Rossi, a moderate feminist, was five years previously one of the sixteen founders of the National Organization of Woman (NOW). Her seminal work, *The Feminist Papers: From Adams to de Beauvoir*, was published in 1973, when many universities were beginning courses in women's studies and feminist studies. Alice Rossi also gave attention early on to abortion rights for women.⁷⁸ In the proceedings of the conference in the references to her Chapter on "Maternalism, Sexuality, and the New Feminism," Rossi cited John Money's research on gender six separate times. In the chapter itself, she states: "With some hesitation, I now plan to attempt a

rather wide-ranging extrapolation from the rigorous research of Anke Ehrhardt and John Money (1967; Ehrhardt et al. 1968a,b; Money et al. 1968), by proposing a direction someone will hopefully take from the results of their research on fetal hormone balance impact on subsequent personality and social behavior.”⁷⁹ Rossi was most interested in how the hormonal balance affected different kinds of variations within a particular sex, in this case female, rather than on ‘the diagnosis and treatment of abnormality.’ She wondered whether the qualities of “high physical energy and psychological toughness... could be triggered by a more-than-usual hormonal balance tipped to androgen excess outside the modal range of female variation?”⁸⁰ Significantly, in this early text Alice Rossi does not use the word ‘gender’ in her chapter, but limited herself to the word ‘sex’ when referring to woman’s identity.

Ten years later Rossi gives a new prominence to the word ‘gender’, in her 1983 Presidential Address to the American Sociological Association, she titles her text “Gender and Parenthood.”⁸¹ Significantly, Alice Rossi adopts the ‘word’ gender without the ideological meaning (of total social construction) that had been given to it by Money and other theorists. For Rossi and many moderate feminists, gender simply became the commonly used word to describe a woman or a man’s identity, including a foundation in biological sex as female or male. In this she affirmed what I will call ‘gender reality.’ In Rossi’s words: “Genes, organisms and environment interpenetrate and mutually determine each other.”⁸²

In 1983 Alice Rossi attempted to bring a reasonable balance back into the meaning and use of the word ‘gender’, which had begun to become captured by various ideologies: “Gender differentiation is *not* simply a function of socialization, capitalist production, or patriarchy. It is grounded in a sex dimorphism that serves the fundamental purpose of reproducing the species.”⁸³ I

agree with Rossi's statement of the importance of the male-female sexual differentiation, as the root ground or foundation for gender. Simply stated: the gender of woman is rooted in her female sex and the gender of man is rooted in his male sex always or for the most part. This leaves room for the occasional natural exception without changing the essential meaning of gender differentiation.

Step Two: Gayle Rubin and the sex/gender system

The context for Rossi's 1983 critique of ideologies of socialization, capitalist production, or patriarchy appears to have been framed in part by the famous 1975 text of Gayle Rubin, "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex."⁸⁴ In this classically Marxist analysis (for example, on the first page Rubin thanks well-known Marxists Emma Goldman for her title and Juliet Mitchell for several of her ideas), Gayle Rubin introduced a new phrase "the sex/gender system" which was soon adopted by feminists of many different ideological orientations as well as more moderate feminists. Springing from a post-Cartesian dualism of mind/body, Rubin introduced the slash in the "sex/gender system" to indicate a separation, division, between the two concepts of biological sex and socialized gender.

Rubin begins her article: "As a preliminary definition, a 'sex/gender system' is the set of arrangements by which a society transforms biological sexuality into products of human activity, and in which these transformed sexual needs are satisfied."⁸⁵ Drawing upon Engels, Freud, Lacan and others she reduces gender and sex identity to socially conditioned: "Sex is sex, but what counts as sex is equally culturally determined and obtained. Every society also has a sex/gender system...; ...[s]ex as we know it—gender identity, sexual desire and fantasy, concepts of childhood—is itself a

social product.”⁸⁶ The forces which control the sex/gender system include “the reproductive moment of a ‘mode of production’”, ‘patriarchy,’ and ‘political economy.’⁸⁷

Rubin’s Marxist analysis drew upon an analysis of Lévi-Strauss for kinship systems, and she concluded that men traded women as a kind of material produce for access to sexual activity and breeding. This becomes an exchange of women for the benefit of men. She concludes: “Gender is a socially imposed division of the sexes. It is a produce of the social relations of sexuality. Kinship systems rest upon marriage.”⁸⁸ Rubin’s analysis also redefined heterosexuality as being socially constructed rather than the natural orientation of women and men towards one another: “Gender is not only an identification with one sex; it also entails that sexual desire be directed towards the other sex. The sexual division of labor is implicated in both aspects of gender—male and female it creates them, and it creates them heterosexual.”⁸⁹ She argues that the sex/gender system oppresses homosexuals just as it oppresses women.

Gayle Rubin concludes her popular essay with an appeal for androgyny and a deconstruction of both gender and sex:

...we are not only oppressed *as* women, we are oppressed by having to *be* women, or men as the case may be. I personally feel that the feminist movement ...must dream of the elimination of obligatory sexualities and sex roles. The dream I find most compelling is one of an androgynous and genderless (though not sexless) society, in which one’s sexual anatomy is irrelevant to who one is, what one does, and with whom one makes love.⁹⁰

Her dream will soon become answered by the gender ideology that redefines gender as a graduated continuum of 5 to 10 or more different possibilities instead of the gender reality through which the human race is naturally divided into the two genders of female and male, man and woman.

During the same time-frame (1975-1983), when new intellectual hosts for the ‘virus’ of gender ideology were being found. While he was working on his several volume *History of*

Sexuality, the French philosopher Michel Foucault (1926-1984) delved into studies and experiences of the San Francisco culture of consensual sado-machism in gay male and lesbian groups.⁹¹ Gayle Rubin followed in the same footsteps when in 1978 she moved to San Francisco to immerse herself in the same culture. Rubin eventually wrote her PhD Dissertation for the University of Michigan in 1994 on this topic, *The Valley of the Kings: Leathermen in San Francisco 1960-1990*.⁹²

Another direction that Michel Foucault also went in his research was to publish the diary of Alexina Herculine Barbin, a young person living in 19th century France, who discovered after many years that she was actually a hermaphrodite. This discovery at the age of 17 caused her great anguish, as she had been educated to be a school teacher in a school for girls. The memoirs reveal the deep suffering that this discovery caused. It also contains the support that was given by the Catholic Church in the person of the Bishop A at age 20 decided to reveal this in a confession to the Bishop: "Everything that the Christian religion can offer by way of encouragement, consolation—I felt it then! . . . The few moments that I spent in the presence of that very great man are perhaps the most beautiful ones of my life. 'My poor child,' he said to me when he had finished his questioning, 'I don't yet know how all this is going to turn out. Will you authorize me to make use of your secrets?'"⁹³

After consulting a doctor, and speaking with the family involved, the decision was made for the young girl to assume the identity of a man, and to leave the small French town, and go to Paris to begin a new life. The anguish of leaving behind all his friends is described in vivid detail in the diary. He went through the legal change "and a rectification be made on the civil status registers, which meant that I was to be entered there as belonging to the masculine sex, and at the

same time I was to be given a new first name [Abel] in place of the feminine one I had received when I was born."⁹⁴ The Bishop arranged for financial aid and a position and "His Excellency clasped my hand warmly, calling me his friend! The memory of this scene is still vivid in my mind;" and the prefect "said to me..."Walk with your head up; you have the right to do so. It will be difficult for you, perhaps. That's understandable."⁹⁵ These brief passages give a sense of the suffering and of the support of the Church. However, over time his money ran out and the suffering of being always alone in Paris led him to reflect "Always abandonment, solitude, outrageous scorn."⁹⁶ Abel Barbin tragically ended his life, leaving the memoir to be discovered after his death.

What conclusions should be drawn from the reality of this affliction and suffering? Michel Foucault begins his introduction with the following suggestion: "Do we truly need a true sex?" With a persistence that borders on stubbornness, modern Western societies have answered in the affirmative."⁹⁷ The implication of Foucault's answer is that if the genital ambiguity in the body of a few people causes suffering, then get rid of the classification of sex as male or female. Dr. Paul McHugh's answer takes an entirely different approach. He argues that the person should be the one who decides "as a sexually differentiated individual emerges from within. Then as the young person gains a sense of responsibility for the result, he or she can be helped through any surgical constructions that are desired."⁹⁸ We will see these two options again in the discussion of gender ideology (which destroys the differentiation between men and women) and gender ideology (which affirms the basic distinction among persons who are nearly always male or female and which helps others with ambiguous genitalia to become who they are most deeply from within.

Step Three: Gender is Mainstreamed as a Social Construct in Anglophone Academia

In the 1980's With the aid of a Social Science and Humanities Research Grant (SSHRC) from Canada for continued work on tracing the history of the concept of woman, I asked a research assistant, Eamon Egan, to review a range of academic literature to determine whether the word 'sex' or the word 'gender' was more often used to describe the respective identities of a woman and a man, masculine and feminine characteristics, or male and female human beings. In this area of study, anthropology, psychology, and sociology led the way while philosophy followed. In 1978, a significant text book *Gender: An Ethnomethodological Approach* was published by the University of Chicago Press and authored by Suzanne J. Kessler and Wendy McKenna.

An analysis of entries of books and articles under the subject heading 'sex' or 'gender' in the Philosopher's index revealed that 1940 to 1983 only the word 'sex' was used. Then in 1983 the word 'gender' began to appear and increased in quantum amounts in the following years.

Notes

1984

1. Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 1065a 2-6.
2. Allen COW I
3. Allen, COW II

4. Allen Logos article, Stein article and JPPII article.
5. I am grateful to Fr. Francis Martin, SSD for this help on understanding the root of the concept of gender in the Hebrew Scriptures in this and the following paragraph.
6. I am very grateful to Fr. Andreas Hoeck, SSD Academic Dean, St. John Vianney Theological Seminary for help identifying the root 'gen' in the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek Septuagint and Latin Vulgate Scriptures as described in this and the following paragraph.
7. See Josselyn Shamos's paper tracing the history of the term gender, page 1 # 3-4. Available at <http://josselyncrane.com/written/samples/gender> [Accessed 11/17/11].
8. A. L. Peck, trans. *Aristotle Generation of Animals* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press and London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1943), introduction lxi, (53).
9. Aristotle, *Generation of Animals* 716a14.
10. For a thorough analysis of this erroneous aspect of his theory see Allen COW I and COW II.
11. Aristotle, *Generation of Animals* 716a25-35.
12. Aristotle, *The "Art" of Rhetoric* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press and London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1926), trans. John Henry Freese, Book III, 1047b 5-6.
13. John Henry Freese, *Aristotle. Rhetoric*, Book III, 1047b 5-6 note d, p. 373. See also, the Loeb edition of an earlier text by Aristotle *On Sophistical Refutations*, trans. E.S. Forster, in which masculine, feminine, and neuter terms are also discussed but without using the term for 'gender.' Here, in addition to the mention of neuter as referring to an inanimate 'it', Aristotle also mentions that sometimes it refers to and undertermined 'it' which could be later identified as either masculine or feminine. See section xiv on solecisms 173b18-174a9.
14. Martin Heidegger, *What is Called Thinking?* trans. J. Glenn Gray (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), 150.
15. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*, ed. Charles Talbut Onions (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966). A similar result can be found by beginning with the Greek root 'γεν' in *A Greek-English Lexicon*, compiled by Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990 edition.) A further similar plethora of words and concepts can be found by tracing Latin words with the root 'gen' flowing from the verb generō. See *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Edited by P.G.W. Glare (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1982).
16. Galen, *On the Usefulness of the Parts of the Body* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1968), B 14 (11, 303). See also Allen, COW I, 187-89.

17. Porphyry, *Pros Gauron*, in André Marie Festugière, *La Révélation d'Herme's Trismégiste* (Paris: Lecoffre, 1944-54), vol. 3, X,1,4,47 (15-24), p. 284. My translation.
18. *A Treatise on the 'Canon of Medicine' of Avicenna* (New York: AMS Press, 1973), Book I, part I, thesis V, no. 123.
19. Mondino da Luzzi, *Anathomia* in *The Fasciculus Medicinae of Joannes de Ketham* (Milan: R. Lier and Co., 1924), p. 75.
20. William Harvey, "Anatomical Lectures on the Generation of Animals." in *The Works* (New York and London: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1965), trans. Robert Willis, MD, exercise 29:392.
21. See *National Union Catalog: Pre-1956 Imprints* (London: Information Publishing Ltd., 1968), vol. 287. pp. 239-64 and 276.
22. Juvenal, Satire VI, in Juvenal and Persius, trans G.G. Ramsay (Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, and London: William Heinemann, Ltd, 1950), l. 250-264, pp. 102-105.
23. *Procès de condamnation de Jeanne D'ARC: Texte, traduction et notes*, ed. Honoré Champion (Paris, 1921). Trans. by author and Christopher Doss.
24. *Procès de condamnation*, pp. 264-65. See also Allen, COW II, pp. 488 ff. for detailed references of her interrogations and responses.
25. Régine Pernoud, *Joan of Arc: By Herself and Her Witnesses and The Retrial of Joan of Arc: The Evidence at the Trial for Her Rehabilitation, 1450-1456* (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd, 1955), pp. 192-93.
26. *Procès de condamnation*, p. 284.
27. Pernoud, *The Retrial of Joan of Arc*, p. 220.
28. *The Oxford English Dictionary of A New English Dictionary On Historical Principles* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1933), Vol., iv: F-G.
29. Its full title was *Hic mulier: or, The Man-Woman: Being a Medicine to sure the Coltish Disease of the Staggers in the Masculine-Feminines of our Times. Expressed in a brief Declamation.*
30. *Hic Mulier*, in Barbara Baines, *Three Pamphlets on the Jacobean Antifeminist Controversy: Facsimile Reproductions with and introduction* (Delmar, New York: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1978), A3, made into modern English by the author as are all other passages from this text. See also the translated text as included in Katherine Usher Henderson and Barbara F. McManus, *Half Humankind: Contexts and Texts of the Copntroversy about Women in England*,

1540-1640 (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1985), "*Hic Mulier*", 265-276. Italics my emphasis.

31. *Hic Mulier*, A 3. See also in Henderson, 265.

32. *Hic Mulier*, B 2, 269-70.

33. *Hic Mulier*, B 6, 275.

34. Its full title captures well its purpose and method: *Haec-Vir: Or The Womanish-Man: Being an answer to a late Book intituled Hic-Mulier. Express in a briefe Dialogue betweene Haec-Vir the Womanish-Man, and Hic-Mulier the Man-Woman. Haec-Vir, or The Womanish-Man*, A3-4. Henderson, 278-89, here 278-79.

35. *Haec Vir*, C3 and Finis, 288.

36. Rene Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy* in *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, trans. John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff, Dugald Murdoch (Cambridge: University Press, 1984), 3 vols., here #78, II, 54.

37. John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. Kenneth P. Winkler (Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 1996), II, xxvii, 7, 137. His emphasis

38. Locke, *Essay*, II, xxvii, 9, 138.

39. Charles Taylor, "Locke's Punctual Self," in *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1989), 159-176, here 172.

40. Taylor, *Sources of the Self*, 159.

41. Margaret Mead, *Male and Female: A Study of the Sexes in a Changing World* (New York: William Morrow and Company, Publishers, 1949), 13.

42. Margaret Mead, *Blackberry Winter: My Earlier Years* (New York: Touchstone, 1972), 200.

43. Mead, *Blackberry Winter*, 216-219. See also, Margaret Mead, *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies* (New York: Harper Collins, 1935).

44. Mead, *Male and Female*, 22. See also, 192.

45. Mead, *Male and Female*, 130.

46. Mead, *Male and Female*, 373.

47. Mead, *Male and Female*, 405.

48. Joseph Zubin and John Money, eds, *Contemporary Sexual Behavior: Critical Issues in the 1970's* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), 212.
49. See John Money, *Love and Love Sickness, the science of sex, gender difference, and pair-bonding* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980)xi, See also, Zubin and Money, eds, *Contemporary Sexual Behavior*, 212; John Money and Patricia Tucker, *Sexual Signatures: On Being a Man or a Woman* (Boston-Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1975), 39 and 129-130.
50. John Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him: The Boy Who Was Raised as a Girl* (New York.London.Toronto.Sydney: Harper Perennial, 2000), 26-34, here 33-34..
51. John Money and Anke A. Ehrhardt, *Man and Woman Boy and Girl: The Differentiation and Dimorphism of Gender Identity from Conception to Maturity* (New York: The Johns Hopkins University Press and Mentor New American Library, 1972), 300-301 and 4. Italics my emphasis.
52. Money, *Man and Woman*, 301 and 4. Italics my emphasis.
53. Saul Rosenzweig, "Human Sexual Autonomy as an Evolutionary Attainment, Anticipating Proceptive Sex Choice and Idiodynamic Bisexuality," in Joseph Zubin and John Money, *Contemporary Sexual Behavior: Critical Issues in the 1970's* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), Chapter 10:189-230, here214-15. For direct references to John Money, see 212, 213, 214, 225, and 226.
54. The study by Michael Diamond, "A Critical evaluation of the Ontogeny of Human Sexual Behavior," is cited in Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him*, 44.
55. The study by Dr Daniel Cappon, Dr. Calvin Ezrin, and Dr. Patrick Lynes, in The Canadian Psychaitrid Association Journal," is cited in Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him*, 45.
56. Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him*, 18.
57. Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him*, 86.
58. Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him*, 86. See also Money, *Sexual Signatures*, 128-42.
59. Money, "Pornography in the Home," *Contemporary Sexual Behavior*. 409-440, here 410.
60. Money, *Man and Woman*, 19.
61. Money, *Man and Woman*, 17.
62. John Money and Patricia Tucker, *Sexual Signatures: On Being a Man or a Woman* (Boston-Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1975), 9. Italics my emphasis.
63. Money, *Sexual Signatures*, 95.

64. Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him*, 107.
65. Paul McHugh, "Surgical Sex", *First Things* (November 2004), page 2 of 6. Dr. McHugh is Distinguished Service Professor of Psychiatry at Johns Hopkins University and a consultant to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops in Washington DC
66. McHugh, "Surgical Sex," p. 3 of 6.
67. McHugh, "Surgical Sex" p. 3 of 6.
68. McHugh, "Surgical Sex," p. 5 of 6.
69. Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him*, 258.
70. Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him*, 191.
71. See for details of these developments, Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him*, 239-244.
72. Colapinto, 'P.S' Insights, Interviews & More..., *As Nature Made Him*, 11.
73. Colapinto, "'P.S' Insights, Interviews & More...", *As Nature Made Him*, 11.
74. John Colapinto's father, a surgeon and chief of urology at St. Michael's Hospital in Toronto, first told his young son about the case of the Reimer twin boys, and about the failed experiment to turn one of them into a girl. John Colapinto's article in the *Rolling Stone* many years later won An American Society of Magazine Editors (ASME) National Magazine Award.
75. The New York Times reviewer was Natalie Angier, and the author of the inside cover remark was Deborah Tannen. Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him* has been cited above.
76. The Symposium was of the 61st annual American Psychopathological Association. Zubin and Money were listed as the 'Committee on Program and the editors of its proceedings published by The Johns Hopkins University Press as *Contemporary Sexual Behavior*, xv.
77. See Money's earlier mentioned paper arguing for introducing pornography in the home and in sex education, *Contemporary Sexual Behavior*, 409-440.
78. In the conference proceedings Saul Rosenzweig's supported early detection of fetal sex and simple abortion so that "parental choice of neonate sex would become fairly simple", *Contemporary Sexual Behavior*, 202. Rossi also wrote: "Feminists of all political stripes have been united in their insistence on the right of women to control their own bodies, have been sharply critical of masculine assumptions concerning female sexuality, and, hence, have demanded safe contraceptives and abortion repeal...", 155.
79. Alice Rossi, "Maternalism, Sexuality, and the New Feminism," in *Contemporary Sexual Behavior*, chapter 8: 145-173, here 152.

80. Rossi, "Maternalism", 155.
81. Alice S. Rossi, "Gender and Parenthood," 1983 Presidential Address, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 49 (February 1984): 1-19.
82. Rossi, "Gender and Parenthood," 11.
83. Rossi, "Gender and Parenthood," 1. My emphasis.
84. Gayle Rubin, "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex, in Rayna R. Reiter, ed., *Toward an Anthropology of Women* (New York and London: Monthly Review Press, 1975): 157-210.
85. Rubin, "The Traffic in Women," 159.
86. Rubin, "The Traffic in Women," 165-66.
87. Rubin, "The Traffic in Women," 167.
88. Rubin, "The Traffic in Women," 179.
89. Rubin, "The Traffic in Women," 180.
90. Rubin, "The Traffic in Women," 204.
91. See Stanley Grenz, *A Primer on Postmodernism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 125-26. Grenz refers his reader to the more detailed account of these events in James Miller, *The Passion of Michel Foucault* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1993), 27-29 and 253. Foucault went to San Francisco in 1975 when he was writing his *History of Sexuality, Volume II: The Use of Pleasure*, Robert Hurley, trans. (New York: Vintage Books: 1986).
92. Available from University Microfilms.
93. *Herculine Barbin, Being the Recently Discovered Memoirs of a Nineteenth-Century French Hermaphrodite*, introduced by Michel Foucault, trans. Richard McDougall (Guillimard, 1978) and Brighton, Sussex: The Harvester Press Ltd., 1980), 77.
94. *Herculine Barbin*, 89.
95. *Herculine Barbin*, 91.
96. *Herculine Barbin*, 110.
97. Michel Foucault, *Herculine Barbin*, introduction vii.
98. Paul McHugh, "Surgical Sex", 3/4.

Sr. Mary Prudence Allen, R.S.M., PhD received her Ph.D. in Philosophy in 1967 from Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California. She taught philosophy at Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada and was named Distinguished Professor Emeritus in 1996. Her areas of specialization are: The Concept of Person in the History of Philosophy, Philosophy of Woman, Existentialism, and Personalism. From 1998 to 2003 she served as Chair, and is presently Professor holding the Endowed Charles J. Chaput, OFM, cap. Chair of Philosophy at St. John Vianney Theological Seminary, Denver, Colorado. She taught for several three years a seminar for ENDOW on various aspects of Pope John Paul II's teaching on the dignity and vocation of woman, wrote and edited study guides for ENDOW, recorded ENDOW's Introduction to Catholic Anthropology for beginning facilitators, and is presently a member of the ENDOW Advisory Committee.

Sister Allen has published a two volume work on *The Concept of Woman* (Grand Rapids, Mi.: Eerdmans, 1997, 2003) and over 40 articles in professional journals. She is presently working on the third volume in this series. She has also presented over 140 professional lectures across the United States and Canada and in England, Israel, and Poland at such organizations as the Canadian Philosophical Association, American Philosophical Association, World Congress of Philosophy, World Congress of Christian Philosophy, American Catholic Philosophical Association, Society for Women in Philosophy, Catholic Fellowship of Scholars, American Academy of Religion, Maritain Association, Lonergan Workshop; at universities such as McGill, University of Toronto, University of St. Paul, Ottawa, Catholic University of America, Fordham University, Notre Dame, University of Dallas, The Catholic University of Lublin, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, The University of Bar-Ilan, Tel Aviv; and for conferences and seminars in various dioceses and institutes of women religious in the United States and Canada.